

ORIGINAL



0000075946

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

28

COMMISSIONERS

MIKE GLEASON - Chairman
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
JEFF HATCH-MILLER
KRISTIN K. MAYES
GARY PIERCE

2007 AUG 20 P 2:05
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

AUG 20 2007

DOCKETED BY	
KK	NR

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF ARIZONA WATER COMPANY, FOR AN
EXTENSION OF ITS EXISTING
CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND
NECESSITY. AT CASA GRANDE, PINAL
COUNTY, ARIZONA

DOCKET NO. W-01445A-06-0199

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF PALO VERDE UTILITIES COMPANY
FOR AN EXTENSION OF ITS EXISTING
CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND
NECESSITY.

DOCKET NO. SW-03575A-05-0926

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF SANTA CRUZ WATER COMPANY FOR
AN EXTENSION OF ITS CERTIFICATE OF
ITS EXISTING CERTIFICATE OF
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY.

DOCKET NO. W-03576A-05-0926

REPLY TO RESPONSE TO MOTION
TO CONSOLIDATE PROCEEDINGS

Arizona Water Company, an Arizona corporation (the "Company"), files the following Reply to the Response of Santa Cruz Water Company, L.L.C. ("Santa Cruz") and Palo Verde Utilities Company ("Palo Verde") to the Company's Motion to Consolidate the above-captioned dockets with Docket Nos. W-01445A-06-0199, SW-03575A-05-0926, and W-03576A-05-0926 (the "Consolidated Dockets").

As a preliminary observation, it bears repeating here that the most compelling reason for consolidating these dockets is that the Company *already* has pending in the Consolidated Dockets an application for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CC&N") for authority to provide water service to the *same area* in which Santa Cruz and Palo Verde are now requesting a CC&N in Docket No. W-03576A-07-0300 and

1 Docket No. SW-03575A-07-0300 (the "New Dockets"). Thus, on its face, it would be
2 difficult to conceive of a more appropriate case for consolidation, in terms of basic
3 questions of law (CCN applications for an identical area) and fact (the facts relating to
4 each application in terms of how each utility would provide water service, location of
5 facilities in the area, rates to be applied, fitness to serve, etc.).

6 Instead of addressing this dispositive issue head on, Santa Cruz and Palo Verde
7 present academic arguments concerning consolidation in the abstract, raise several
8 "red herring" arguments, and make incorrect assertions.

9
10 **I. THE NEW DOCKETS AND THE CONSOLIDATED DOCKETS HAVE COMMON**
11 **ISSUES OF LAW AND FACT AND SHOULD BE CONSOLIDATED**

12 On page 2 of their Response, Santa Cruz and Palo Verde cite authority that
13 actually supports consolidation. They attempt to distinguish the findings and holdings of
14 these authorities, but these arguments support, not diminish, the Company's arguments
15 for consolidation. Santa Cruz and Palo Verde fail to point out that one of the cases they
16 cited, *Hancock v. McCarroll*, 188 Ariz. 492, 495, 937 P.2d 682, 685 (App. 1996), held
17 that consolidation of cases is permitted as a matter of convenience and economy of
18 administration for which the trial court is given broad discretion, which is not disturbed
19 on appeal unless there is abuse of discretion. In addition to *Hancock*, where
20 consolidation was affirmed even though the issues were different, Arizona courts have
21 permitted consolidation to avoid confusion. Examples include consolidation of suits for
22 divorce by husband and wife in the same court, Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 42(a)
23 (incorporated in the Commission's Rules of Procedure by A.A.C. R14-3-101(A)) *Allen v.*
24 *Superior Court*, 86 Ariz. 205, 209, 344 P.2d 163, 166 (1959), and in two separate
25 personal injury actions filed by different occupants of the same vehicle that collided with
26 a parked truck, *S.A. Gerrard Co. v. Couch*, 43 Ariz. 57, 29 P.2d 151 (1934).

27 The same standards apply to the Commission as its procedural rules permit
28 consolidation when the issues are substantially the same. See A.A.C. R14-3-109(H). In

1 this case, the issues are identical, i.e., which utility should receive a certificate of
2 convenience and necessity for exactly the same area, and which utility's application is
3 most favored by the public interest.

4 Most significant, however, is the Commission's own treatment of the
5 consolidation question in other Company cases. In Docket No. W-01445A-98-0667, the
6 Company filed an application for a CCN expansion area that included part of a CCN
7 expansion area contained in another utility's pending application. The Company filed a
8 Motion to Consolidate that was opposed by the other applicant and the Staff. The
9 Commission granted the Company's Motion to Consolidate, while finding as follows:

10 Big Park and Staff both asserted in their Responses that
11 consideration of the entire AWC Application with the Big Park hearing on
12 the Fisher Property will complicate the issues to be considered regarding
13 the Fisher Property. However, the existing territories of the Applicants are
14 both contiguous to the contested Fisher Property territory. Therefore, any
15 decision to determine which company should be granted the exclusive
16 right to serve the Fisher Property territory requires consideration of both
17 Applications in their entirety.

18 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the entirety of the Arizona
19 Water Company Application is hereby consolidated with that portion of the
20 Big Park Application which has not yet been heard.

21 Docket No. W-01445A-98-0667, Procedural Order, page 3, lines 3-10
22 (January 11, 1999).

23 The Commission's treatment of this issue has continued to be consistent through
24 the years. In addition to the consolidation of the Consolidated Dockets which, as noted,
25 was on the Commission's own motion, the Company filed a competing application in
26 another docket, W-01445A-04-0755, et al., that included all of the CCN expansion area
27 contained in a pending application, and some additional area. The Company filed a
28 Motion to Consolidate its application with the competing, pending application, which
29 contained all of the Company's CCN expansion area. In that case, the Commission
30 ruled as follows:

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above-captioned proceedings
2 shall be consolidated for purposes of hearing with respect to the
3 applications to provide water service.

4 Docket W-01445A-04-0755, et al., Procedural Order, page 2, lines 8-9
5 (November 4, 2004).

6 The Commission's practice, as documented by these rulings, is to routinely
7 consolidate CCN applications for hearing where the same area is included in two
8 competing applications. Santa Cruz and Palo Verde were not able to cite a single CCN
9 case in which the Commission ruled otherwise in the same situation.

10 In Section II.C of the Response, Santa Cruz and Palo Verde refer to the
11 Consolidated Dockets and the New Dockets as an "unwieldy mass," and present an
12 incomplete and misleading table to support their argument. However, their argument is
13 flawed and incorrect.

14 First, the Santa Cruz and Palo Verde geographic "location" of the Consolidated
15 Dockets' CCN area is incorrect. The Commission, on its own, ordered the dockets
16 consolidated, thus, any attempt to distinguish the Company's CCN area as "much of
17 Western Pinal County" and Santa Cruz's as "South of Maricopa" was already rejected
18 by the Commission in the Consolidated Dockets. The Consolidated Dockets and the
19 new Dockets thus include the same geographic area, and the Santa Cruz and Palo
20 Verde attempt to geographically distinguish them is groundless.

21 Second, labeling the New Dockets as "Part of Legends Development", in an
22 attempt to contrast it to the Company's CCN area in the Consolidated Dockets, is
23 equally specious. The critical, undeniable fact that is identical to the New Dockets and
24 the Consolidated Dockets is that the CCN expansion area included in the New Dockets
25 is exactly the same as part of the Company's CCN area in the Consolidated Dockets.
26 This falls squarely within the "common question of law and or fact" required for
27 consolidation by the Commission's procedural rules, A.A.C. R14-3-109(H).

1 Third, the "numerous differences" Santa Cruz and Palo Verde cite between the
2 New Dockets and the Consolidated Dockets are neither numerous nor different. The
3 CCN expansion area in the New Dockets is contained entirely within the area
4 addressed in the Consolidated Dockets. That is a common fact, not a difference. In
5 addition, there are requests for service for this area, as Santa Cruz has pointed out, and
6 that is a common fact, not a difference. The issue of landowner "support", that Santa
7 Cruz and Palo Verde cite as a difference, is in reality landowner "preference", which is a
8 common issue concerning what is in the public interest. This issue is for the
9 Commission, not the landowner, to decide.

10 Finally, the alleged "benefits" of common providers and integrated service are
11 allegations, not facts, and the Company has challenged Santa Cruz and Palo Verde to
12 prove them in the Consolidated Dockets. They are issues common to, not differences
13 between, the New Dockets and the Consolidated Dockets.

14 **II. CONSOLIDATION WILL NOT CAUSE UNDUE PREJUDICE,** 15 **INCONVENIENCE AND DELAY**

16 The timing and content of the New Dockets were chosen by Santa Cruz and Palo
17 Verde, not the Company or the Commission. Santa Cruz and Palo Verde cannot
18 seriously complain that the timing of their filings (more than a year after the
19 consolidation order in the Consolidated Dockets) is now prejudicial or inconvenient for
20 them. They freely and knowingly chose the timing of their filing, and the CCN expansion
21 area, realizing full well that it is part of the same area contained in the Consolidated
22 Dockets. This is a "red herring" because, not only is there no undue prejudice or delay,
23 it is a situation created exclusively by Santa Cruz and Palo Verde.

24 Moreover, the stay in effect in the Consolidated Dockets concerns only the
25 hearing portion of the case. As the Commission knows, the contested discovery portion
26 of these cases continues, and the Company has argued to the Commission in pending
27

1 motions that it is largely the Global parties' deficient responses to the Company's
2 discovery requests that resulted in the stay in the first place.

3
4 **III. THE STAFF HAS FOUND THE COMPANY'S APPLICATION**
5 **TO BE INDEPENDENTLY VIABLE**

6 Santa Cruz and Palo Verde argue that the Company's application is not
7 independently viable. However, it is the Staff, on behalf of the Commission, that
8 determines when a CCN application is independently viable, i.e., that it is
9 administratively sufficient for the Commission to consider. The Staff determined this
10 question in the Company's favor in the Consolidated Docket when it found the
11 Company's application to be sufficient on July 28, 2006. Whether the Company or
12 Santa Cruz or Palo Verde can prevail on their applications remains to be seen, but the
13 question of independent viability was decided long ago.

14 **IV. CONCLUSION**

15 The New Dockets and the Consolidated Dockets contain basically identical
16 issues of law and fact. Santa Cruz and Palo Verde have presented no viable basis for
17 considering and hearing separately a CCN application for the same territory by the
18 same applicants; to do so would be a tremendous waste of Commission time and
19 resources. The Company's Motion to Consolidate the New Dockets and the
20 Consolidated Dockets should be granted.

21 ...

22 ...

23 ...

24 ...

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 20th day of August, 2007.

2
3 ARIZONA WATER COMPANY

4
5 By: Robert W. Geake
6 Robert W. Geake
7 Vice President and General Counsel
8 ARIZONA WATER COMPANY
9 Post Office Box 29006
10 Phoenix, Arizona 85038-9006

11 and

12 Steven A. Hirsch
13 Rodney W. Ott
14 BRYAN CAVE LLP
15 Two North Central Avenue, Ste. 2200
16 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4406
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **ORIGINAL** and 17 **COPIES** of the foregoing filed this 17th day of July, 2007 with:

2 Docket Control Division
3 Arizona Corporation Commission
4 1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

5 **COPY** of the foregoing was hand-delivered this 17th day of July, 2007 to:

6 Yvette B. Kinsey, Esq.
7 Administrative Law Judge, Hearing Division
8 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

9
10 **COPY** of the foregoing was mailed this 17th day of July, 2007 to:

11 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
12 Legal Division
13 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

14 Ernest G. Johnson
15 Director, Utilities Division
16 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

17
18 Michael W. Patten, Esq.
19 Timothy J. Sabo, Esq.
Roshka, DeWulf & Patten, PLC
One Arizona Center
20 400 E. Van Buren, Ste. 800
Phoenix, AZ 85004
21 Attorneys for Applicants
22 Santa Cruz Water Company, L.L.C.
and Palo Verde Utilities Company, L.L.C.

23 Ken Franks, Esq.
24 Rose Law Group, PC
25 6613 N. Scottsdale Road, Ste. 200
Scottsdale, AZ 85250
26 Attorneys for Bevnorm Olive, LLC and
Hampden & Chambers LLC

1 Kenneth H. Lowman
2 Manager
3 KEJE Group, LLC
4 7854 W. Sahara
5 Las Vegas, NV 89117

6 Craig Emmerson
7 ANDERSON & VAL VISTA 6, LLC
8 8501 N. Scottsdale Road, Ste. 260
9 Scottsdale, Az 85253

10 Jeffrey W. Crockett
11 Marcie Montgomery
12 Snell & Wilmer
13 One Arizona Center
14 400 East Van Buren
15 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
16 Attorneys for CHI Construction Company

17 Brad Clough
18 ANDERSON & BARNES 580, LLP
19 ANDERSON & MILLER 694, LLP
20 8501 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 260
21 Scottsdale, Arizona 852536

22 Philip J. Polich
23 GALLUP FINANCIAL, LLC
24 8501 N. Scottsdale, #125
25 Scottsdale, Az 85253

26
27 By: Robert W. Geake